Journal of Public Management & Social Policy

Volume 21 | Number 1 Article 5

June 2015

Towards Policy Advocacy — Activism, Advocacy and Political Empowerment: An Exploratory Study on Hispanic Environmental Justice Nonprofits

Jo Marie Rios
Texas A&M University—Corpus Christi

Towards Policy Advocacy — Activism, Advocacy and Political Empowerment: An Exploratory Study on Hispanic Environmental Justice Nonprofits

Jo Marie Rios
Texas A&M University—Corpus Christi

Environmental justice groups have incorporated as nonprofit organizations that tend to limit the ability to access the political and policy processes due to the restrictive IRS lobbying codes. Policy advocacy begins to address the roles and tactics that could be utilized by these nonprofits to influence public policy making and includes activities and tactics such as media campaigns, research, educational outreach, activism and political empowerment with the ultimate goal of influencing the initial stages of the policy process. This research uses a multiple streams approach to operationalize the advocacy variables and tactics used by these Hispanic environmental justice nonprofits and assesses the extent that these tactics have enabled them to mainstream into the policy making process as non-institutional actors. These nonprofits are most successful in identifying problems and have had some success in providing solutions. They have been least successful in gaining media attention and working with elected officials.

The environmental justice movement initially emerged to battle the injustices of unequal implementation of national environmental laws in minority and low-income areas. This movement began as a grassroots effort to link ecological and social justice issues and promote the values of equitable environmental policy making while eradicating the perception of environmental racism as advanced in the 1991 First National People of Color Leadership Summit. The tactics used at that time included those available to social movements, such as the politics of protest and others which fell outside the political and policy processes (Bullard 1993; Gelobter 1992; United Church of Christ Commission for Racial Justice 1987; Environmental Protection Agency 1992). These groups met with mixed success. Since that time, some environmental justice groups, particularly the Hispanic groups, have experienced a paradigm shift transitioning them from being grassroots groups to nonprofit organizations. There has been a dearth of systematic studies that investigate the Hispanic environmental justice groups. This article investigates the tactics and strategies used by Hispanic environmental justice nonprofit 501c(3) organizations in their attempt to influence policy decisions. These efforts are primarily at the local level, and focuses on Hispanic, low-SES

neighborhoods that shoulder high levels of environmental contamination and discriminatory practices in environmental policymaking

Recent empirical evidence indicates that the environmental justice groups have lost some of their grassroots characteristics and have not followed the trajectory of transforming into political movements or interest groups. Instead, evidence suggests that about 99 percent of these groups have incorporated into 501c(3) nonprofit organizations. The advantages of incorporating as nonprofits include the ability of these organizations to serve on advisory committees, boards and other informal groups. As 501c (3) nonprofits, these organizations can also provide research data, technical advice, and political support to local agencies and develop their political leadership skills (Berry and Arons 2001; Schneider and Ingram 2005). The most important aspect of incorporating as a 501C(3) organization is that it lends legitimacy for inclusion in the regulatory process. Some of the tactics used by nonprofits may enable them to participate in the traditional policymaking processes such as identifying problems and proposing solutions.

However, for minority and disenfranchised groups such as the Hispanic organizations, the disadvantages of incorporating as 501c(3) nonprofits may be problematic due to the constraints imposed by the federal regulations for incorporation status that include restrictions on lobbying, engaging in partisan politics and advocating for the disenfranchised population they represent (Berry and Arons 2001). This article focuses on the Hispanic subpopulation based on an empirical survey of environmental justice groups and conducts a bivariate statistical analysis based on the tactics used by these organizations and their perceptions of success. The population for this exploratory study was identified by using several sources. The response rate for the Hispanic groups was relatively low yielding a sample that was heavily represented by the nonprofit organizations operating along the U.S.-Mexico border region, even though the survey was targeted nationally.

The public policy literature is rich in the treatment of the intersection between policy influence and political behavior. However, incorporating into nonprofit organizations tends to limit the ability of these nonprofits to access the political and policy processes due to the restrictive IRS lobbying codes established for these organizations. There is currently a nascent field of study within the public policy literature that begins to address the roles and tactics that could be utilized by these nonprofits to influence public policy. This field of study is termed policy advocacy and includes activities and tactics that can be used by nonprofits to shape policy decisions. These activities include media campaigns, research, educational outreach, activism and political empowerment with the ultimate goal of influencing the initial stages of the policy process (problem identification and agenda setting). This research will provide a policy advocacy framework correlating the policy advocacy variables and tactics used by these Hispanic nonprofits with their perceptions of success that may be more generalizable to other Latino groups and lead to inclusion in the policy process

Environmental Justice

At the national level, the environmental justice groups emerged in the early 1990s as a self-proclaimed grassroots movement focused on battling the injustices in the implementation and enforcement of national level environmental laws, with an ultimate goal of policy inclusion (Bryant and Hockman 2005; Taylor 1992; Bullard 1993; Wernette and Nieves 1992, 16). Bullard (1994) argues that the environmental justice groups formed prior to the 1970s and that the Commission for Racial Justice (1987) began to provide legitimacy

and scope. Historically, the emergence of this movement emanated from two sources. The grassroots component consisted of an aggrieved population that mobilized for social action to deter pollution-prone activities in neighborhoods that are characterized as having high concentrations of politically disenfranchised groups defined by race, ethnicity, gender and socioeconomic status (SES). The other element of the movement was mobilized by scholars who published studies on the effects of race and low SES on the implementation of national level environmental policies. The environmental justice groups used these studies to mobilize using the tactics of the politics of protests, demonstrations, and court injunctions to stop polluting industries in states such as Texas, West Virginia, Louisiana, and Alabama (Baugh 1991).

During these early years, the environmental justice groups shared many of the characteristics of social movements. They represented an aggrieved population that is politically disenfranchised, that lacks representation in the American political process, and that engages in activism with the intent of fostering reform or social change. Other characteristics of social movements are that they tend to be fluid and informal organizations that can mobilize large numbers of people for direct action and that usually lack a single leader to coordinate their activity. Organizational strength determines the ability to sustain the organization through networking and coalition-building. The most important characteristic of social movements is that they engage in the politics of protest that fall outside the traditional political process of electoral politics and interest group lobbying, The normal evolution of social movements, if groups are able to sustain their organizational strength, is to transform themselves into political movements or interest groups in order to lobby politicians within the political process (McAdam 1982; Tilly 1983; Oliver 1989; Gerhach and Hine 1970).

Hispanic Activism and Advocacy

Historically the largest Mexican-American political organizations have not addressed environmental issues even while engaging in public education and advocacy for the members of their community. The largest national organizations for Mexican-Americans, such as the United National Council of La Raza (UNCLR) and League of United Latin American Citizens (LULAC), as well as important regional organizations like the Mexican-American Legal Defense and Education Fund (MALDEF) or the American G.I. Forum, have traditionally stressed voting rights, education, and veteran's benefits as important areas of concern. Furthermore, Hispanic groups have chosen more conciliatory approaches to politics, as was evidenced by their willingness to support broader themes of engagement with Anglos (Quiroz 2002; Martinez 2009). And while identity construction has been an important for Latino organizations (Marquez 2009), the diversity of the Hispanic movement has made speaking with a single voice difficult (Espino, Leal, and Meier 2007).

Activism has also been shown to be effective in changing the nature of political debate over issues of concern to Hispanics. The 2006 marches supporting immigration reform and immigrant rights reflected that mobilization and street presence may have had some effect in bringing national attention to this issue (Benjamin-Alvarado, DeSipio, and Montoya 2009). However, as Cordero-Guzmán (et al. 2008) argue, they should not be seen as spontaneous "happenings," but rather the result of cooperation amongst numerous immigrant-serving nonprofit organizations. It was the inter-group collaboration and networking that laid the foundation for the protests, as well as effective broad-based public education campaigns just

prior to the demonstrations that made them so effective.

Some of the success of the immigration debate can be attributed to the role of labor unions. Historically, immigration activism gained the support of labor unions such as the United Farm Workers in the 1960s. At that time, the UFW provided organizational capacity and external organizing strategies while the immigration movement coalesced as a social movement for direct action or peaceful protests though community organizing (Jenkins 1985). More recently, immigration advocacy and labor advocacy merged when the AFL-CIO determined that these two issues areas needed to be simultaneously addressed so that wages would not be depressed (Griffith and Lee 2012). Most importantly, the AFL-CIO brought higher levels of organizational capacity, external organizing strategies and a sense of political legitimacy.

Most recently, the political rhetoric surrounding Latino activism has focused on waking the "sleeping giant" in terms of the political process (voting) and on the policy process (immigration). The anti-Hispanic, anti-immigration stance of the Republican Party spurred native-born Hispanics to support the Democratic candidate. Some success can be claimed even though there was only a meager ten percent voter turnout rate for the 2012 election (Pew Research Center 2012). In terms of policy issue areas, the window of opportunity opened to place immigration reform on the national agenda in response to the focusing event of the perception of anti-Hispanic sentiment and loss of votes for the Republican Party. According to the Pew Hispanic Center (2010), approximately seventy percent of the native-born Hispanics support immigration reform primarily due to the state-level immigration statutes enacted by numerous states such as Arizona.

However, immigration is not the most important policy issue area for Hispanics. In 2010, the results of the National Survey of Latinos indicated that native-born Hispanics identified the policy issue areas of education (55%), jobs (53%), health care (49%) and the environment (32%) as being the dominant and salient issues for this population. Yet, the Hispanic population has had limited success in these policy issue areas. The recent immigration movement has provided some lessons and insights with regard to the tactics and strategies used to work within the system to gain national attention. While the Hispanic population continues to be considered politically disenfranchised, this aggrieved subpopulation continues to strive for political inclusion. The legacy of Hector P. Garcia, the Latino civil-rights champion, advanced who the position that it was that a necessary condition for this population to become politically empowered, was two-fold: to engage in the political process though voting and to influence the policies that affect the Hispanic population by working within the system.

Distinct from the more traditional interest groups like LULAC and the American GI Forum, environmental justice groups, including Hispanic groups, have engaged in efforts to educate and organize the local community. By encouraging their members to speak in a more united fashion, and to network with other groups, they try to influence government and private actors. They undertake research which produces credible, and usable, information. Finally, they have also engaged in symbolic politics, including the politics of protest (McAdam, Tarrow, and Tilly 2001; Sikkink and Keck 1998).

While differences exist between urban and rural locations, the data from this research tends to indicate that the tactics used by Latino environmental justice nonprofit organizations are homogeneous trending toward political empowerment. Differences in perceived success are often related to group's organizational capacity, the political culture within a state or

locality and community support (Ringquest 2004). The environmental justice organizations surveyed in this study appear to support this argument. California and New York have traditionally been considered as progressive while Texas has been known for its conservative approach to politics and policies. The Hispanic organizations involved in broad-based environmental justice issues, especially in the Southwest, used different tactics than most of the Black groups. Rios (2012) found that the Latino organizations are more likely to engage in education and training strategies focusing on political empowerment skill-building such as acquiring capacity-building and leadership skills, training in policy writing and decision making. These tactics are advanced by the Southwest Industrial Areas Foundation (IAF) which targets a bottom-up approach to leadership building and political empowerment. This Saul Alinsky model promotes community-building through networking, organizing local groups and setting local agendas. Professional organizers identify potential community leaders and provide leadership training (Putman and Feldstein 2003; Shirley 1997).

In Texas, this typology was used by environmental justice activists to address the vast number of the peri-urban settlements that emerged along the Texas-Mexico border. These *colonias* are unincorporated communities that tend to abut the assembly plants or *maquiladoras* and where the levels of pollution and contamination may lead to higher levels of water-borne and vector-borne diseases related to contaminated water (Rios and Valdez 2001). In 1992, the Texas Department of Health found that between 1989 and 1991, the incidence of anencephalic births (babies born without brains) was four times the national rate. Two Interagency Faith (IAF) affiliates, Valley Interfaith and El Paso Inter-religious Sponsoring Organization (EPISO), have advocated for political empowerment and self-help assistance of minority communities. Valley Interfaith targeted issues related to labor, education, and the *colonias*, helping to obtain over $450 million state and federal dollars for water and sewer lines for poor communities. EPISO's focus was to improve community housing, health, and employment. This group has organized efforts to acquire state grants for roads, power lines, sewer lines, and water tanks in the El Paso *colonias* (Mauleon and Ting 2001).

In the Southwest, environmental activism has been spearheaded by two NGO's that have multiple policy ends. The Southwest Organizing Project (SWOP) organized groups and helped form the Water Information Network, which worked to protect water safety and sewer services. It also had a political component in that it lobbied the New Mexico legislature (Rios 2006). The Southwest Network for Environmental and Economic Justice (SNEEJ) consists of approximately 70 grassroots groups from both the U.S. and northern Mexico and has focused on labor, education, and environmental rights.

Hispanic environmental justice organizations in California are more numerous and have more access to the state government due to its willingness to recognize the legitimacy of the demands of environmental justice groups. The state has instituted an Environmental Justice action plan which requires Cal/EPA's boards and departments to develop guidance on precautionary approaches, to develop guidance on cumulative impacts analysis, and to improve tools for public participation and community capacity building (California Environmental Protection Agency 2004). California established the Cal/EPA Interagency Working Group on Environmental Justice (IWG) to assist in the development of an environmental justice strategies as well as the establishment of the Cal/EPA Advisory Committee on Environmental Justice. These two bodies work together to gather the input of a diverse group of stakeholders from various regions and backgrounds by conducting public

workshops on numerous environmental justice objectives (California Environmental Protection Agency 2004).

The environmental threat facing Hispanic populations in California is diverse, from polluted air and water (Pastor Morello-Frosch, and Sadd 2006) to disproportionate proximity to toxic waste (Kelly 2003; Hipp and Lakon 2010). The Latino Issues Forum is involved in a wide array of issues, including education, health, and sustainability and has assisted numerous groups across the state, including the Latino Environmental Health Leadership Institute (LEHLI), the Latino Environmental Health Network (LEHN) and the Rural Water Collaborative. Another group, Communities for a Better Environment (CBE), works in urban communities in Northern and Southern California among low-income Hispanics and other ethnic minorities who suffer from exposure to from multiple sources of pollution.

Policy Advocacy and the Policy Process

The policy process is a set of dynamic and iterative stages that are used as a heuristic tool to study policy influence and government intervention. These stages include problem identification, agenda setting, policy formulation, legitimization, implementation, appropriations, and evaluation (Peters 2013). While the nonprofit literature tends to focus on the regulatory process which is associated with the implementation stage, this research focuses on the inclusion of these organizations in the first three stages before a law is enacted.

There is a growing literature on policy advocacy for nonprofits and there is consensus that it would be beneficial for these organizations to influence the agenda setting stage of the policy process (Berry 2007). The activities that could influence this stage of public policy include efforts to educate or promote an issue or provide a policy response, to build leverage by bringing attention about a particular problem to the media's attention, to promote solutions to social problems, to engage in grassroots lobbying, to increase civic engagement, to provide research and technical assistance and education and training to enhance leadership skills (Vaughn and Arsneault 2014; Miller-Steven and Gable 2012; Abramson and McCarthy 2002). More importantly, nonprofits would benefit from forming networks and participating with other advocacy coalitions to build social capital and influence public policy (Boris and Maronick 2012; Rios 2012; Berry 2007).

In placing these activities within a more generalizable framework, this study will use Kingdon's (1995) multiple streams approach for agenda setting by quantifying the variables to assess the extent to which the tactics utilized by the Hispanic environmental justice organizations have been successful, according to their own perceptions. The tenets for this model include: the problem identification stream, the political stream, and the policy stream. In the problem identification stream, policy entrepreneurs and other hidden participants are often involved in bringing the problems to the attention of the elected officials, and to the public, in order to garner political support. Policy entrepreneurs often use the media to do this. They are also involved in trying to frame an issue in a particular way, because how a problem is defined often determines its solutions. The political steam reflects the support of the elected officials, political will, and interest group lobbying (Kingdon 1995).

Problem Identification Stream. The tactics variables used as indirect measures for the problem identification stream (PROBLEMID AND MEDIATTN) are: ORGANIZE (organizing other groups), NETWORK (networking with other groups), and EDUCATE (educating and training).

Political Stream. The political stream involves the political receptivity for an agenda item. This stream can be gauged by partisan ideological stances, public opinion, and elections of new administrations. It is within the political stream that interest groups (non-institutional actors) can advocate, lobby, persuade, and bargain for policy initiatives (Kingdon 1995). It is also within the realm of the political stream that other institutional or visible actors, such as the bureaucracy, can advocate or oppose the problem definition, propose solutions or initiatives. In this study, the tactics variables LOBBY (lobbying politicians) and PROTEST were used as a direct measure of these groups' involvement in the political stream (ELECTOFF and PUBAGENCY).

Policy Stream. The policy stream is composed of a fluid group of policy entrepreneurs who work in specific policy issue areas. They continuously develop solutions to problems both latent and identified. It is the role of the policy entrepreneurs to read the political cues for the timing of the short-term policy window to open and to push for their proposed solutions with the expectation of coupling the three streams and affecting agenda setting (Kingdon 1995). For the policy stream, the tactics variables include RESEARCH (researching issues), SOLUTIONS (providing solutions to a problem, and VOICE (having a voice for input) are used as direct measures.

Methods

This article focuses on the policy issue area of the environment. The research question assesses the extent that the Hispanics environmental justice nonprofits activities and tactics have enabled them to mainstream into the policy making process as non-institutional actors. More specifically, this research tests the hypothesis that the environmental justice nonprofit organizations have not been successful in accessing the policy process due to the 501c(3) status.

To examine the salient tactics and strategies used by environmental justice organizations that may influence their perceptions of success, an on-line survey of readily identified environmental justice groups was conducted in the summer of 2006. Using SurveyMonkey.com, each identified environmental justice group was contacted via email. The survey asked questions about activities that reflected the tactics that might resemble interest group behavior such as lobbying, electoral politics, and research (Eichner 1996; Walker 1991) in addition to outsider tactics such as organizing grassroots efforts, education and training, gaining media coverage, litigation, and, finally, the politics of protest (McAdam 1982; Oliver 1989). The survey took about 20 minutes to complete. If there was no response from the organization after two weeks, a second attempt via email was made. The respondents were acknowledged and thanked via email.

The Environmental Justice Resource Center's People of Color Environmental Groups Directory 2000, a general web-based search of environmental justice groups and the Environmental Protection Agency's group's database provided the sample for the study since the Directory was somewhat dated. The intent of the web-based search for additional groups was to stratify the subpopulations by race and ethnicity so that no single group would be overrepresented. These groups were categorized by EPA region. Groups that had an email address were sent the survey link. Only 25 addresses bounced, indicating that the email address, and presumably the organization, was no longer functional. In all, 503 emails were

sent to identifiable Environmental Justice groups and 86 surveys were completed yielding a response rate of 17%. However, after culling through the surveys, only 64 surveys were usable, yielding a 13% response rate.

The survey question on populations served asked the respondents to identify all that apply. After reviewing the surveys, the organization's web sites were sometimes re-visited in order to further define their populations and make some substantive decisions for categorization of these groups. The scope was limited to include only those groups identified as serving Hispanic populations. Table 1 provides the distribution of survey responses by race. For this study, twenty groups (31.3% of the population) were included, representing Region 2 (NY, NJ), Region 4 (KY, TN, NC, SC, MS, AL, GA, FL), Region 6 (TX, NM, OK, AR, LA) and Region 9 (CA, NV, AZ).

Table 1. *Environmental Justice Groups Population by Race*

EPA Region	**Race**						
	Hispanic	**%**	**African-American**	**%**	**Multiple and other**	**%**	**Total**
1	0	0	2	50%	2	50%	4
2	3	50%	1	16.7%	2	33.3%	6
3	0	0	2	100%	0	0	2
4	2	25%	3	37.5%	3	37.5%	8
5	0	0	1	50%	1	50%	2
6	8	53.3%	2	13.3%	5	33.3%	15
7	0	0	3	75%	1	25%	4
9	7	41.2%	0	0	10	58.8%	17
10	0	0	1	16.7%	5	83.3%	6
Totals	**20**	**31.3%**	**15**	**23.4%**	**29**	**45.3%**	**64**

The variables used in this study were derived from the social movement, interest group, and environmental justice literature. Social movements and interest groups emerge for the express purpose of influencing the political process. Each group typology utilizes different tactics to attempt to achieve its goals. For example, social movements tend to use outsider tactics such as protests and demonstration, while interest groups subscribe to insider tactics such as lobbying for legislation to benefit their membership (Lofland and Johnson 1991; Diani 1992; Oliver 1989). Access to the political process is oftentimes accomplished through inclusion of non-institutional actors in the policy process through the different stages of the

policy cycle such as problem identification, agenda setting, and policy formulation or providing solutions or alternatives to problems. The tactics variables include those activities that may promote success or inclusion (Walker 1991; Eichner 1996). The success variables were derived from the tactics, strategies and goals presented in the environmental justice literature (Bryant and Mohai 1992; Rosen 1994; Taylor 1992; Miller 1993). These variables are presented in Table 2

Table 2. *Variables List for Tactics and Perceptions of Success*

Variable	Label	Measurement Scale	μ(Mode)
Tactics Variables			
RESEARCH	Researching issues	Percentage (0 – 100)	12.70 (5)
ORGANIZE	Organizing other groups	Percentage (0 – 100)	14.75 (0)
EDUCATE	Educating and training	Percentage (0 – 100)	26.10 (30)
NETWORK	Networking with other groups	Percentage (0 – 100)	12.95 (10)
LOBBY	Lobbying politicians	Percentage (0 – 100)	4.15 (0)
PROTEST	Protesting, demonstrating, boycotting	Percentage (0 – 100)	6.80 (2)
Success Variables			
PROBLEMID	Helping identify problems within your service population	Scale 0 – 5; 0 = not applicable	4.40 (5)
SOLUTIONS	Providing Solutions	Scale 0 – 5; 0 = not applicable	3.55 (3)
VOICE	Gaining a voice at the table of committees or boards	Scale 0 – 5; 0 = not applicable	4.00 (5)
MEDIATTN	Gaining media attention	Scale 0 – 5; 0 = not applicable	3.75 (4)
COURTORD	Soliciting court or legal injunctions against polluting companies	Scale 0 – 5; 0 = not applicable	2.65 (1)
PUBAGNCY	Working with public agencies	Scale 0 – 5; 0 = not applicable	3.40 (4)
ELECTOFF	Working with elected officials	Scale 0 – 5; 0 = not applicable	2.70 (4)
PROTESTSU	Success in protesting, boycotts, demonstrations	Scale 0 – 5; 0 = not applicable	3.15 (5)

Tactics variables. These variables include: RESEARCH (researching policy issues), ORGANIZE (organizing other groups for some type of action), EDUCATE (educating and training either internally or externally), NETWORK (networking, coalition-building or community building), LOBBY (lobbying elected officials), and PROTEST (participating in protests or direct action). The first five variables measure the ability of the nonprofit groups in this study to engage in activities that would lead to inclusion in the policy process (Arons 2007). The PROTEST variable indicates continued use of outsider tactics which are primarily

employed to gain media attention. The tactics variable is measured as a percentage ranging from 0 – 100. A score of 0 indicates that a group did not engage in that tactic.

Success variables. These variables measure the groups' perception of success based on a categorical analysis of the environmental justice literature (Miller 1993). These variables include: ELECTOFF (contacting or working with elected officials), PUBAGNCY (working with public agencies), SOLUTIONS (drafting policy solutions), PROBLEMID (helping to identify problems for service population), VOICE (gaining a voice at the table of commissions and boards), MEDIATTN (gaining media attention to bring awareness to the problem), COURTORD (soliciting legal injunctions against companies), PROTESTSU (success in demonstrations). Arons (2007) identifies these variables as necessary for inclusion in the policy process. These variables were measured on a scale of 0 – 5 (0 = not applicable; 1 = little success to 5 = great deal of success).

Analyses and Results

Measures of central tendency were derived for this population as reflected in Table 2.The means and the modes are reflected in this table. The focus of this study was to evaluate the activities used by these groups that may have led to their perceptions of success. Because none of these variables exhibited a normal population due to the small sample size (n = 20), a nonparametric correlation analysis and the Spearman's ρ was used. While the bivariate analysis is not used to claim causation, the correlation coefficients can be used as a possible indicator of a relationship between the two variables.

In interpreting the measures of central tendencies, the tactics variables measure the time spent on each of these activities while the success variables measure the groups' perceived level of success as reflected in Table 2. These groups report that they spend approximately 26.10 percent of their time on educating and training (EDUCATE); 14.75 percent of their time organizing other groups (ORGANIZE) although the mode of 0 indicates that that there are a fair amount of groups that do not participate in this tactic; 12.95 percent on networking with other groups (NETWORK); and, 12.70 percent of their time researching issues (RESEARCH). Only 6.80 percent of their time is spent on protesting or demonstrating (PROTEST). Even less time (4.15%) is spent on lobbying politicians (LOBBY) while the mode of 0 indicates that many groups do not engage in this activity possibly due to their nonprofit status which prohibits lobbying (Berry and Arons 2001).

For the success variables, these groups perceived themselves to be most successful in helping identify problems within their service population (PROBLEMID) with a mean or 4.40 and gaining a voice at the table on committees or boards (VOICE) as reflected in the mean of 4.00. They perceived themselves to be least successful in obtaining court orders for legal injunctions against polluting companies (COURTORD) based on a mean of 2.65 as well as working with elected officials (ELECTOFF) with a mean of 2.70.

Table 3 presents the correlation analysis used to look for bivariate relationships between the tactics used by these groups and their perceived level of success.

The problem identification variable (PROBLEMID) resulted in a positive relationship with the ORGANIZE (organizing environmental justice groups) variable as reflected by the moderate correlation coefficient of .504 (p = .023). This suggests that as groups identify environmental justice problems, they then attempt to organize and mobilize the affected population.

Table 3. ***Correlation Analysis for Hispanic Groups: Tactics and Perceptions of Success***

Success Variables	**Tactics Variables**					
	RESEARCH	**ORGANIZE**	**EDUCATE**	**NETWORK**	**LOBBY**	**PROTEST**
PROBLEMID	-.122 .608	.504* .023	-.289 .217	-.278 .235	.135 .571	-.076 .750
SOLUTIONS	.227 .335	-.089 .708	-.167 .482	-.063 .793	.503* .024	-.051 .832
VOICE	-.079 .740	.110 .643	.046 .848	-.173 .466	-.147 .537	.046 .846
MEDIATTN	-.116 .625	.184 .438	.213 .366	.030 .901	-.136 .569	-.155 .515
COURTORD	.427 .060	-.476* .034	-.325 .162	.294 .209	.166 .484	-.288 .218
PUBAGNCY	-.334 .150	-.197 .404	-.027 .910	.445* .049	.001 .996	-.021 .931
ELECTOFF	.090 .706	-.420 .065	-.029 .902	.409 .078	.307 .188	.190 .423
PROTESTSU	-.108 .652	.379 .099	-.018 .940	-.188 .428	.069 .772	.790** .000

* p < .05
** p < .000
N = 20

The solutions variable (SOLUTIONS) reflected a moderate positive relationship based on with LOBBY (lobbying politicians to provide possible solutions) based on the correlation coefficient of .503 (p = .024). An interpretation of this finding is that some of these groups have had some success in presenting solutions to environmental justice problems and that politicians have been receptive. The variable for working with public agencies (PUBAGNCY) was positively related to the NETWORK variable demonstrated by the moderate correlation coefficient .445 (p = .049). This finding indicates that these groups might have had success by expanding their networks outside the environmental justice groups to include public agencies. This finding may also support their perceived success in participating on agency advisory boards.

For the success variable COURTORD (obtaining court orders or legal injunctions against polluting companies), the ORGANIZE tactic variable resulted in a negative relationship with a moderate correlation coefficient or -.476 (p = .034). An interpretation of

this finding is that organizing other environmental justice groups for court action does not lead to a successful legal outcome. The PROTESTSU (Protest Success) variable was highly correlated (.790, p = .000) with the PROTEST tactics variable indicating that those groups who do engage in this activity perceived themselves to be very successful. Groups most often protest to gain media attention in order to demonstrate the plight of the affected population. However, for this study population, the variable MEDIATTN (gaining media attention) was negatively related with the PROTEST variable.

Kingdon's (1995) approach is useful for disaggregating agenda setting within the policymaking process, suggesting that different tactics could be used by Hispanic environmental justice organizations at different points in this process. The approach also suggests that success can also be defined in multiple ways, again depending upon the stages of the process. Table 4 reflects a correlation coefficient sign analysis used to uncover the strategies viewed by these organizations as successful based on the tenets of the Multiple Streams Model for agenda setting. The value for each of the correlation coefficients is not considered in this analysis. Instead, only the direction of the sign provides a positive (+) or negative (-) impact. The tactic variable ORGANIZE was positively related to the success variable PROBLEMID, but negatively related to the success variable CORTORD. The tactic variable NETWORK was positively related to the PUBAGNCY variable. For the political stream, the tactic variable LOBBY was positively related to the success variable ELECTOFF. Also in the political stream, the tactic variable PROTEST was positively related to the success variable PROTESTSU. Finally, in the policy stream the tactic RESEARCH was negatively correlated to the success variable VOICE whereas LOBBY was positively related to SOLUTIONS.

Table 4. *Correlation Coefficient Sign Analysis for the Multiple Stream Policy Model*

Stream	Tactics Variables	Success Variables	Correlation Coefficient Sign
PROBLEM STREAM	ORGANIZE	PROBLEMID	**+***
	ORGANIZE	COURTORD	**-***
	EDUCATE	PROBLEMID	**-**
	EDUCATE	MEDIATTN	**+**
	NETWORK	PUBAGNCY	**+***
	NETWORK	ELECTOFF	**+**
POLITICAL STREAM	LOBBY	ELECTOFF	+
	PROTEST	PROTESTSU	+
POLICY STREAM	RESEARCH	VOICE	**-**
	LOBBY	SOLUTION	**+***

***p<.05**

Discussion and Conclusion

The environmental justice movement emerged as a self-proclaimed grass-roots movement to battle the injustices of inequitable implementation of environmental standards in minority and low-income communities. However, environmental justice can be considered more of an umbrella term for numerous typologies of activism ranging from direct action to networking (Rios 2000). Rios (2012) also found that the type of activism varies across subpopulations. The environmental justice literature has tended to focus on the African-American population; however, very little systematic research has been conducted on the

Hispanic population. More recently, the vast majority of the environmental justice organizations have incorporated as nonprofits which have both advantages and disadvantages. One of the principle advantages is that it lends legitimacy to the organization in terms of competing for resources and inclusion in the regulatory process. This research analyzes the tactics and perceptions of success in the Hispanic population based on empirical research. This study uses a multiple streams approach to assess the potential success for the inclusion in the policy process through the use of policy advocacy for nonprofit organizations. When these three streams (problem, political, and policy) converge, a window of opportunity opens in order to access the policy process. The political stream signals the convergence.

According to the finding of this study, the tactics used by the Hispanic environmental justice nonprofits have been most successful in the problem stream. The Hispanic environmental justice organizations identified their most common tactics as: EDUCATE, NETWORK, and ORGANIZE. These groups perceived that they have had high levels of success in problem identification (PROBLEMID) based on measures of central tendency. The correlation analysis found that tactic variable ORGANIZE was moderately correlated and statistically significant for the success variable PROBLEMID. In terms of perceptions of success, the importance these groups place on problem identification was also clear.

The tactics variable NETWORK was positively correlated to the success variable PUBAGNCY, which may indicate that the public bureaucracies have been inclusive of these nonprofits as evidenced by a statistically significant correlation between networking and public agencies. Some evidence of this success is provided by the California environmental justice nonprofits in their dealings with both the state and federal bureaucracies.

The tactics variable EDUCATE was the single most important tactics variable, at least in terms of time committed to it, as reported by the nonprofits. Interestingly, there was no single success variable that was strongly associated with it. In fact, it had a negative association with nearly all the other success variables. A content analysis of the questionnaires in this survey shed some light for this variable. About seventy percent of the Hispanic-serving environmental justice organizations identified this tactic as training of the organization's members in developing leadership skills, building organizational capacity, and training in policy and decision-making. As nonprofit organizations, it becomes necessary for the survival of the organization to spend time (re)training a revolving set of members (Anheier 2005; Werther and Berman 2001).

One common perception of environmental justice groups is that they rely on the media to draw attention to their situation, but this was not supported in this study. The tactics variables EDUCATE, ORGANIZE, and NETWORK were only weakly related to the success variable MEDIATTN. This suggests that these groups may not consciously seek media attention, and when they do, they do not seem to think that it has a strongly positive impact. It might also suggest that the media does not perceive environmental justice issues to be salient.

The tactics variable ORGANIZE was moderately but negatively correlated (with statistical significance) to the success variable COURTORD. Litigation and court orders are common in environmental justice disputes and can arise at any point. However, they often come near the end of the dispute, when groups have failed to redress the situation politically and court injunctions are sought as a last resort. They may also come about as a result of legal actions initiated by government, or private actors, in reaction to the activities of

environmental justice groups (Ringquist 2004; Roberts and Toffolon-Weiss 2001). In either case they are costly endeavors where the environmental justice groups may be easily out-resourced.

The findings indicated that the environmental justice nonprofits spent a small percentage of their time lobbying politicians and perceived that they had little influence in the policy stream. Lobbying is considered to be the most crucial tactic to influence policy outcomes by providing solutions. Sherman (2008) noted that when citizen activists develop positive working relationships with local officials they can affect the types of decisions reached by local government by providing information to the legislators. This study suggests that the Hispanic environmental justice groups were successful (with statistical significance) when they engaged in lobbying (LOBBY) their elected officials and provided solutions (SOLUTIONS) to the identified problems. However, the conundrum for the nonprofit status of the Hispanic environmental justice organizations in this study is that there is limited potential use of this tactic, since nonprofits were barred from direct lobbying. This barrier could be circumvented through the use of the education tactic used by many nonprofits as an indirect mechanism to lobby politicians (Berry and Arons 2001).

The policy stream is regarded as an essential component of the multiple streams model when used as a heuristic typology. This model postulates that a solution must be available to address the identified problem once the window of opportunity opens. The environmental justice organizations have had some success in the policy stream. The organizations in this study perceived that they had high levels of success gaining a voice at the table (VOICE) based on measures of central tendency. The groups considered gaining a "voice at the table" to be a necessary condition, but apparently not a sufficient condition for success as evidenced by the weak correlation with any of the tactics variables. On the other hand, one of the tactics that contributes to the policy steam is providing solutions. A statistically significant correlation was found between the variables providing solutions (SOLUTIONS) and lobbying elected officials (LOBBY). Nonprofit organizations, in general, would benefit from training in crafting solutions to problems through public policy capacity building (Arons 2007).

The general findings of this study indicate that the Hispanic environmental justice nonprofits have engaged in some tactics that would enable them to mainstream into the policy process. This analysis is based on Arons (2007) framework on proposed tactics and capacity building for nonprofits. While many of the elements appear to be present, many will require further development such as the use of media, activism, networking, lobbying and crafting policy solutions. Networking might include engaging other environmental justice organizations and mainstream environmental nonprofits to build issue networks or advocacy coalitions. Different organizations bring different strengths into the policy stream, especially in terms of resources and institutional capacity. There is, however, a potential threat to the existence of environmental justice nonprofits due to the divergence of populations served, mission statements and goals. The environmental justice nonprofits in this study did not appear to engage in activism. This tactic needs to be expanded through networking and organizing to include media coverage to build community support and to apply pressure on the elected officials. Crafting policy solutions would involve training by academics on the policy process, policy making, stakeholders and designing alternatives.

These mainstream tactics are essential for policy advocacy for nonprofits, in general. However, for environmental justice and other social welfare organizations, an

activist component continues to be necessary in order to draw attention to the problem, or the focusing event. The most significant principle driving the policy process is that legislation, at all levels of government, is based on single policy issue areas. Rios (2012) found that environmental health was the one issue area common to all environmental justice subpopulations. At this time, the environmental justice nonprofits engage in multiple issue areas and, in effect, have diluted their impact.

Authors Biographies

Dr. Jo Marie Rios is a Professor of Political Science and Public Administration at Texas A&M University—Corpus Christi where she teaches public policy, public administration and urban politics and policy. She has conducted federally funded research on the *colonias* on the Texas-Mexico border. Her research areas include: environmental health, environmental infrastructure and environmental justice. Dr. Rios is a nationally recognized American Political Science Association policy scholar and has published numerous articles related to this research in *Policy Studies Review, Journal of Borderland Studies, Journal of Border Health, Journal of Public Management and Social Policy, Journal of Rural Research and Policy, Environmental Justice,* among others.

References

Abramson, Alan, and Rachel McCarthy. 2002. Infrastructure organization in *The state of nonprofit America*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution.

Anheier, Helmit. 2005. *Nonprofit organizations theory, management policy*. New York: Routledge.

Arons, David F., ed. 2007. *Power in policy, a funder's guide to advocacy and civic participation.* St. Paul MN: Fieldstone Alliance.

Baugh, John H., 1991. African Americans and the environment: A review essay. *The Policy Studies Journal* 19(2):1182-1191.

Benjamin-Alvarado, Jonathan, Louis DeSipio, and Celeste Montoya, 2009. Latino mobilization in new immigrant destinations: The anti-H.R. 4437 protest in Nebraska's cities. *Urban Affairs Review* 44:718-735.

Berry, Jeffrey. 2007. Nonprofit organizations as interest groups: The political passivity in A. Cigler and B. Loomis, eds. *Interest group politics, 7th ed.* Washington DC: CQ Press.

Berry, Jeffrey, and David Arons. 2001. *A voice for nonprofits.* Washington DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Boris, Elizabeth T., and Matthew Maronick. 2012. Civic participation and advocacy. In *The state of nonprofit America*. Washington DC: Brookings Institution

Bryant, Bunyant, and Elaine Hockman. 2005. A brief comparison of the civil rights movement and the environmental justice movement. In *Power, justice and the environment: A critical appraisal of the environmental justice movement*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Bryant, Bunyan, and Paul Mohai. 1992. *Race and the incidence of environmental hazards: A time for discourse.* Boulder: Westview Press.

Bullard, Robert. 1993. *Confronting environmental racism: Voice from the grassroots.* Boston: South End Press.

California Environmental Protection Agency. 2004. *Environmental justice action plan.*

Sacramento: State of California.
Cordero-Guzmán, Hector, Nina Martín, Victoria Quiroz-Becerra, and Nik Theodore. 2008. Voting with their feet: Nonprofit organizations community and immigration mobilization. *America Behavioral Scientist*, 52:598-617.
Diani, Mario, 1992. The concept of social movements. *The Sociological Review* 40(1):1-25.
Eichner, Charles. 1996. *Extraordinary politics, how protest and dissent are changing American democracy*. Boulder CO: Westview Press.
Espino, Robert, David Leal, and Kenneth Meier, eds. 2007. *Latino politics: Identity, mobilization and representation*. Charlottesville: University of Virginia Press.
Gelobter, Michel. 1992. Toward a model of environmental discrimination. In *Race and the incidence of environmental hazards, a time for discourse,* eds. Bunyan Bryant and Paul Mohai. Boulder: Westview Press.
Gerhach, Luther, and Virginia Hine. 1970. *People, power, and change: Movements of social transformation.* Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.
Griffith, Kati, and Tamara Lee, 2012. Immigration advocacy as labor advocacy. *Journal of Employment and Labor Law* 33(1):79-117.
Hipp, John, and Cynthia Lakon, 2010. Social disparities in health: Disproportionate toxicity in minority communities over a decade. *Health and Place* 16:674-683.
Jenkins, Craig. 1985. *The politics of insurgency: The farm worker movement in the 1960s.* New York: Columbia University Press.
Kelly, William, 2003. Noxious neighborhoods. *California Journal* 20-23.
Kingdon, John. 1995. *Agendas, alternatives and public policies, 2nd ed.* New York: Harper Collins.
Lofland, John, and Victoria Johnson, 1991. Citizen surges: A domain in movement studies and a perspective on peace activism in the 1980s. *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change* 13:1-29.
Marquez, Benjamin, 2001. Choosing issues, choosing sides: Constructing identities in Mexican-American social movement organizations. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 24:218-235.
Martinez, Deirdre. 2009. *Who speaks for Hispanics?* Albany: State University of New York Press, Albany.
Mauleon, Victoria, and Clarence Ting. 2001. Hung out to dry. *HighCountryNews,* March 12, 33:1-2.
McAdam, Doug. 1982. *Political process and the development of black insurgency, 1930-1970.* Chicago IL: The University of Chicago Press.
McAdam. Davis, Sidney Tarrow, and Charles Tilly. 2001. *Dynamics of contention*. Oxford: Cambridge.
Miller, Vernice. 1993. Building on our past, planning for our future: Communities of color and the quest for environmental justice in *Toxic struggles, the theory and practice of environmental justice.* ed. Richard Hoftichter. Philadelphia: New Society Publishers.
Miller-Steven, Katrina L., and Matthew J. Gable, 2012. Antecedents to nonprofit advocacy: Which is more important – governance or organizational structure? *Journal for Nonprofit Management* 15(1):21-39.
Oliver, Pamela, 1989. Bringing the crowd back in: The non-organizational elements of social movements. *Research in Social Movements, Conflict and Change* 11:1-39.

Pastor, Manuel, Rachel Morello-Frosch, and James Sadd, 2006. Breathless: schools, air toxics, and environmental justice in California. *Policy Studies Journal* 34:337-362.

Peters, Guy. 2013. *American public policy, promise and performance, 9th ed.* Sage/CQ Press.

Pew Hispanic Center. 2010. Illegal immigration backlash worries, divides Latinos. http://www.pewhispanic.org/files/128.pdf

Pew Research Center. 2012. Hispanic Trends. http://www.pewhispanic.org/

Putman Robert D., and Lewis M. Feldstein. 2003. *Better together, restoring the American community.* New York NY: Simon and Schuster.

Quiroz, Anthony, 2002. Class and consensus: Twentieth-century Mexican American ideology in Victoria, Texas. *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* 106:1-54.

Rinquest, Evan. 2004. Environmental justice. In *Environmental governance reconsidered,* eds. R. Durant, D. Fiorino and R. O'Leary. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Rios, Jo Marie, 2000. Environmental justice groups: Grass-roots movement of NGO networks? Some policy implications. *Policy Studies Review* 17:179-211.

Rios, Jo Marie. 2006. *National survey of environmental justice group.* June-July.

Rios, Jo Marie, 2012. Is there an environmental justice bandwagon effect? A subpopulation analysis of self-reported accomplishments. *Environmental Justice* 5:287-292.

Rios, Jo Marie, and Avelardo Valdez. 2001. The relationship between infrastructure, utilities and the incidence of illness in the border colonias. *Journal of Border Health* 5(2):31-40.

Roberts, J. Timmins, and Melissa Toffolon-Weiss. 2001. *Chronicles from the environmental justice frontline*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rosen, Ruth, 1994. Who gets polluted: The movement for environmental justice. *Dissent* 223-230.

Schneider, Anne, and Helen Ingram, eds. 2005. *Deserving and entitled: Social constructions and public policy.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Sherman, Davis, 2008. Disruption or convention? A process-based explanation of divergent repertoires of contention among opponents of low-level radioactive waste sites. *Social Movement Studies* 7:265-280.

Sikkink, Kathy, and Margaret Keck. 1998. *Activists beyond borders: Advocacy networks in international politics*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press.

Shirley, Dennis. 1997. *Community organizing for urban school reform.* Austin: The University of Texas Press.

Taylor, Dorceta, 1992. The environmental justice movement (expanding the dialog). *EPA Journal* 18(1):23-25.

Texas Department of Health and Centers for Disease Control. 1992. *An investigation of a cluster of neural tube defects in Cameron County, Texas.* Austin TX: Texas Department of Health.

Tilly, Charles, 1983, Speaking your mind without elections, surveys or social movements. *Public Opinion Quarterly* 47:464-478.

United Church of Christ Commission for Racial Justice. 1987. *Toxic waste and race in the United States: A national report on the racial and socio-economic characteristics of communities with hazardous waste sites*. New York: United Church of Christ.

United State Environmental Protection Agency. 1992. *Environmental equity: Reducing risk for all communities*. Washington DC: Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Policy and Planning.

Vaughn, Shannon K., and Shelly Arsneault. 2014. *Managing nonprofits in a policy world.* Los Angeles CA: Sage/CQ Press.

Walker, Jack. 1991. *Mobilizing interest groups in America: Patrons, professions and social movements.* Ann Arbor MI: University of Michigan Press.

Werther, William, and Evan Berman. 2001. *Third sector management: The art of managing nonprofit organizations.* Washington D.C.: Georgetown Press.

Wernette, Dee R., and Leslie A. Nieves, 1992. Breathing polluted air, minorities and disproportionately exposed. *EPA Journal* 18(1):16-17.